



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,157	11/18/2003	Anthony E. Faltesek	H0005694 8364/90288(1190)	5301
24628	7590	07/18/2007	EXAMINER	
WELSH & KATZ, LTD 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			LEE, PING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2615	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/716,157	Applicant(s) FALTESEK ET AL.	
	Examiner Ping Lee	Art Unit 2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-11,14,16,25 and 27-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-11,14,16,25,27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 2 and 6-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: on line 2 of claim 1, "a plurality of audio modules" is specified; on line 3, "at least one module" is specified, and on line 5, "the plurality of modules" is specified. It appears that they are all audio modules. However, the claim language does not clearly state the relationship between the devices specified in lines 2, 3 and 5. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9-11, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoi et al (hereafter Yokoi) (US 4,709,330) in view of Appleby et al (hereafter Appleby) (GB 2 299 668).

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 11, Yokoi discloses a system comprising:

a plurality of audio modules (located at 3a, 3b, 3c and 3d in Fig. 2 or 21a in Fig.

2),

a common control unit (2) in communication with the plurality of modules; an output device (8 in Fig. 1; 39 and 32 in Fig. 2) coupled to the control unit.

Yokoi fails to show that the control unit presents at least audio information received at various of the modules, via the output device, with the presented audio indicative of the presence of individuals or selected environmental conditions in the

vicinity of the respective module; and which includes at least one of circuitry or software to automatically analyze audio received at the control unit with respect to at least one fire signature, to establish if an alarm condition is present in the vicinity of at least one of the modules. Yokoi teaches the use of a fire detector mounted on the ceiling. In the same field of endeavor, Appleby teaches the disadvantages of having the ceiling-mounted fire detector (p. 1). Most importantly, Appleby pointed out that the ceiling-mounted fire detector would not be effective if it was not properly installed regarding the dimension of the room. Appleby teaches another fire detector using an audio output transducer and an audio input transducer. A software will automatically analyze the audio received with respect to at least one fire signature to establish if an alarm condition is present (abstract, p. 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Yokoi by replacing some of fire detector and sensor with the transducers and the software as taught in Appleby in order to effectively detect the fire and save the lives when it is difficult to properly install ceiling-mounted fire sensor.

Regarding claim 2, although not clearly illustrated, an audio input device (39) is located at the control unit and transducers are located in at least some of the audio modules (24 or 41) (col. 4, lines 20-23; col. 6, line 58+; abstract)

Regarding claim 7, the bandwidth of the filter in Appleby is between 20 Hz to 150 Hz (p. 3, line 23).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Yokoi teaches thermal sensor (5). The software as taught in Appleby would be modified for processing thermal related signals as well as sonic signals.

Regarding claims 25 and 27, Yokoi further discloses a user interface.

4. Claims 8, 14, 16, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoi and Appleby as applied to claims 1, 11 and 25 above, and further in view of Markowitz et al (hereafter Markowitz) (US006295346B1).

Regarding claims 8, 14, 16, 28 and 29, Yokoi fails to show how to analyze audio using a circuitry or software. Markowitz teaches how to use speech recognition software to help identify the urgent message from a remote location. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Yokoi and Appleby by utilizing speech recognition software as taught in Markowitz in order to help the administer to correctly identify the urgent message from the workers at the remote location.


Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ping Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-7522. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian C. Chin can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Ping Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2615

pwl